

and discussions on your strategic overall plan.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRBACHER,
Member of Congress.

SMART SECURITY AND THE NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when Senator John Danforth stepped down as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations earlier this year, President Bush had an option. He could nominate a new Ambassador who would work with the nations of the world to address the growing threat of terrorism and resource scarcity, or he could nominate one of the usual suspects, someone who would maintain the administration's unilateral thinking. By nominating John Bolton, President Bush chose the latter.

As Under Secretary of State for Arms Control, John Bolton demonstrated his poor leadership skills by bullying his colleagues. He demonstrated disdain for international diplomacy by refusing to meet with certain foreign leaders, and he openly criticized the very institution, the United Nations, to which he now has been nominated to represent the United States. This behavior is not going to win the United States many friends on the international stage.

Without a reelection campaign to worry about, President Bush could have utilized the U.N. ambassadorship as a means of helping America regain its lost credibility as the most important democratic Nation in the world. He could have helped America begin its recovery from the mistakes he made in the run-up to the Iraq war and the international alliances that were shattered as a result. But when it comes to addressing America's lost credibility around the world, it remains business as usual for the White House. It seems that the Bush administration has more important matters to take care of, like the shameful way it is working to end the decades-old tradition of the filibuster in the Senate.

The nomination of John Bolton epitomizes the Bush administration's not-so-subtle pattern of disregard for multilateral institutions. Whenever possible, President Bush and his administration continue to sway from the international consensus, not towards it.

But the fight against international terrorism does not belong to a single country, particularly in this era of globalization. When the Internet connects people thousands of miles apart at the mere click of a button, we need to recognize that we are all in it together, because acts of terrorism, abusive regimes, and resource scarcity affect everyone, everyone on the globe. That is why it is more important than ever to work with other nations and

the multilateral institutions that guide them, like the United Nations and the international criminal court.

Mr. Speaker, next week, I will reintroduce the SMART Security resolution legislation that does take into consideration the need for international cooperation in the post-September 11 world. In order to effectively address the threat of terrorism, SMART Security works to strengthen international institutions and respect for the rule of law. We cannot possibly strengthen the United Nations if our own U.N. Ambassador has contempt for the institution he is trying to serve.

Instead of continuing to emphasize our differences with other nations, the United States needs to break its current cycle of shameful unilateralism. We need to court the institutions that used to celebrate America's participation, and our efforts must not stop there. If the U.S. expects other countries to relinquish pursuit of nuclear weapons, then we had better honor our international commitments to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, to the Biological Weapons Convention, to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

□ 2015

The United States is at its strongest when we lead the rest of the world towards peaceful resolution of conflicts by working with the rest of the world. This is the way we need to address the growing crisis in Iran and North Korea and the way to ensure that members of international terrorist groups like al Qaeda are caught and brought to justice. The ambassadors that serve the United States abroad reflect our values here at home. The nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations is not consistent with America's best values, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. It is time the Bush administration started working with the nations of the world. That world needs to begin here at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in the place of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise President Bush's ongoing efforts to carry democracy and freedom to the farthest corners of the Middle East.

Like some of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity recently to travel to this part of the world, to Iraq, to Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Cyprus and Israel. These experiences left me extremely encouraged about the prospect of freedom in the Middle East. I believe we are witnessing a crucial moment in world history as democracy is planting roots in countries previously overrun by terrorists and tyrants.

The most visible instance of this is in Iraq. Four short months ago, Iraqi citizens braved terrorist threats and bodily harm to turn out at the polls in amazing numbers. Today, the fruits of their labor are evident, and the Iraqi people can finally look forward to a future in a free and a democratic society. They have a government that serves as a voice for all Iraqis, be they Kurdish, Sunni, Shiite, Christian, or any of the many other ethnic and religious groups represented in the new government.

Like the Iraqi people, citizens of Afghanistan are also enjoying new-found freedoms. Our United States Armed Forces have liberated millions of Afghans, paving the way for a democratic Afghani government, one that is committed to fighting terrorism on its own.

But Iraq and Afghanistan are not the only nations where freedom is marching, Mr. Speaker. The roots of democracy grow wide, and they have begun their spread into Iran, Syria, Palestine, Libya, and perhaps even Saudi Arabia. The list of democratic accomplishments in the region is growing, suggesting that a true change in outlook and culture is occurring in the Middle East.

Syria has begun pulling its troops out of Lebanon. Israel is working with the Palestinian people to pull troops and settlers out of Gaza, and the post-Arafat PLO is increasingly willing to put this kind of diplomacy over terrorism. Libya has begun the voluntary dismantling of its nuclear program, and Egypt has agreed to allow multi-candidate elections.

Any one of these accomplishments alone would be reason to rejoice; but taken together, they signal an ever-growing, irrevocable force for change across the globe. What we are accomplishing in the Middle East is far more than winning the war on terror. We are winning the war of ideas. People around the globe are crying out for freedom.

Democracy, representation, the opportunity to disagree, these are all essential developments that foster freedom; and we are seeing them spread